

the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 2, 1920, by Adolph Goldmark & Sons, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that said product consisted in whole or in part of a filthy vegetable substance.

On April 8, 1920, the L. Cohen Grocery Co., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that as much of the product as was fit for food (194 sacks) be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a satisfactory bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7896. Misbranding of Ring's Rose Injection. U. S. * * * v. 15 Bottles of Ring's Rose Injection. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10371. I. S. No. 12931-r. S. No. E-1427.)

On May 21, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 15 bottles of Ring's Rose Injection, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., consigned on or about January 18, 1919, by Charles L. Huisling, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the product made by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of lead and zinc, acetates and sulphates, alcohol, and water perfumed with oil of rose.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, appearing on the labels and in the circulars accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was a treatment, remedy, and cure for gonorrhœa, gleet, whites, and all improper discharges of the sexual organs in male and female, cutaneous diseases, stricture, venereal sores, cutaneous eruptions, pimples, sun burns, and prickly heat, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On May 10, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7897. Misbranding of Pabst's Okay Specific. U. S. * * * v. 12 Dozen Bottles and 12 Dozen Bottles of Pabst's Okay Specific. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 10083, 10084. I. S. Nos. 2423-r, 2752-r. S. Nos. W-309, W-310.)

On April 23, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 12 dozen bottles and 12 dozen bottles of Pabst's Okay Specific, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that 6 dozen bottles of the article had been shipped on September 28, 1918, 6 dozen bottles on November 18, 1918, and 12 dozen bottles on December 11, 1918, by the Pabst Chemical Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the